

WEATHER FACTS.
WABRIN, April 19.—Ohio
Warmer and generally fair
weather.

SPRINGFIELD, O.,
April 19, 1887.

He Cables Henry Labouchere, Editor of
"Truth" and M. P. That Parrell Never
Wrote Him that "Times" Letter.

Standerone's Willful Shanderone. Sena-
torial Discharge from Custody in
Missouri. Railroad Accidents.

By the Associated Press.
LINCOLN, Neb., April 19.—Mr. Patrick
Egan has addressed the following cable
message to Hon. Henry Labouchere:

"Standerone's statements in reference to
me are unmitigated and willful shanderone.
Parrell never wrote me any such letter as
that quoted in the London Times. The
whole thing is a base fabrication."

DRIVING OUT THE SETTLERS.
Trouble Fearsed on Account of the Presi-
dent's Order.

MILWAUKEE, April 19.—A Minneapolis
special says: Captain E. E. Egan, in-
fantry, stationed at Fort Snelling, received
orders yesterday to proceed at once to Win-
nebago and Crow Creek reservations and
drive the settlers from these lands.

The company under command of Cap-
tain Myers left yesterday evening
and camped at Lanning last night.

The order was issued for the purpose of
the destruction of property if necessary,
and the use of guns and ball.

The greatest excitement exists and it would not be
surprising to see a miniature Red rebellion
instituted on these lands. This territory
was thrown open by the Arthur adminis-
tration on February 25, 1884, and thousands of
homesteaders from all parts of the United
States rushed in and took possession of the
lands. Cleveland's revocation of Arthur's
proclamation made hundreds of settlers

THE GROWING CROPS.
Generally Favorable Reports from Many
States.

CLEVELAND, April 19.—The Ohio Farmer
of this week will give reports from over
fifty counties in Ohio and a large number
from eight other states and Canada, as fol-
lows: About one-fourth of the counties in
Ohio report prospects for a crop of 25 to 50
per cent. of last year's crop; half of the
counties will have 50 to 75 per cent., and
the other quarter from 75 to 90 per cent. of
the crop. Only two counties in Ohio re-
port a fair crop.

Reports from Indiana, West Virginia, and
Kentucky are very similar to the Ohio re-
ports. In Michigan report 50 to 75 per cent.
of full crop, while Canada, New York,
Kentucky, Maryland and Missouri report
fair to full and abundant crops. In Vir-
ginia, when the matter was mentioned at
all, it appears that good drainage, good
preparation of soil and proper fertilizing
have prevented any injury, except from recent
drought.

NO SUPREME COURT JURY.
Important Decision on a Point Inciden-
tally Raised in a Railroad Suit.

COLUMBUS, O., April 19.—In the suit of
Corbin to eject the Union, from the control
of the Cleveland and Canton road, the
defendants demanded a jury trial before the
supreme court. The court decided this
morning that they had not the right to trial
by jury in this case. This is the first time
that this question was ever decided in Ohio.

DYNAMITE.
Two Men Killed—Others Injured.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., April 19.—At 9
o'clock this morning an explosion oc-
curred at shaft No. 2 of the new aqueduct
in the north heading. John Coyne was in-
stantly killed and a Hungarian, whose
name is unknown, was fatally injured.
Five others were hurt, some with broken
bones and arms and eyes blown out. The
accident was caused by the explosion of a
dynamite cartridge which remained unex-
ploded in one of the previous tunneling
holes.

FLORIDA.
The Senatorial Campaign.

JACKSONVILLE, Fla., April 19.—The
deadlock in the state legislature over the
senatorial question continues. The demo-
cratic caucus balloted all last night without
result. The last ballot was taken about 12
o'clock this morning and stood: Perry, 42;
Bloxham, 41. The caucus then adjourned
till evening. Arrangements are being
made for a meeting of the legislature on
the 21st inst. to elect a senator.

Assigned.
CINCINNATI, April 19.—Louis & Co.,
dealers in furniture and household goods,
etc., assigned today to Fred A. Johnson.

The assets are estimated at \$35,000; li-
abilities, \$40,000. The assignment was
caused by an attachment to secure a judg-
ment for \$20,000, in favor of Mrs. Edgar
M. Johnson. Preferences were made
amounting to \$15,000, of which \$12,000
was in favor of Annie Delacher, Lon-
don, England, an aunt of Mr. Fred Louis,
who alone carried on the business.

Picked Up at Sea.
NEW YORK, April 19.—The steamer Ben-
edict, from Wilmington, which arrived
yesterday, reports April 16th of Cape Hat-
ters picking up a yawl boat containing
Captain Henderson and four men, being
part of the crew of the schooner George
Matts, from Baltimore, for Charleston, she
having been from some unknown cause
blown up and took fire at 4 o'clock that
morning, killing the first mate, Mr. Suley
and one seaman. Those rescued lost every
thing except what they had on, one of whom
was badly burned about the face and hands.

Railroad Accident.
ST. JOHNSVILLE, N. Y., April 19.—A
passenger train on the New York Central
railroad met with an accident near this
place at 11:30 o'clock last night. A land-
slide caused the rails to spread, throwing
the engine from the track. Engineer Ed-
ward Cahart was killed, and Fireman E.
Wilce, of Albany, had a leg broken. The
passengers were badly shaken up, but none
were seriously injured.

AN OHIO MAN.
He Is Discharged from Custody in Mis-
souri.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., April 19.—Samuel
C. Schaffer, late of Lancaster, Ohio, was
discharged in Judge White's court, on an
order for having him a man named Allen
to kill John T. Blair, of New Jersey.
Allen failed to appear.

Terrific Storm Reported.
CHARLESTON, W. Va., April 19.—A ter-
rific storm passed over this section of the
state yesterday, doing little damage here
but sweeping timber, small houses, fences,
etc., in the country districts south of here.
Above Kanawha Falls large trees were
thrown across the railroad track, detain-
ing trains. The damage cannot be estimated.

Mr. Blaine Starts East.
CHICAGO, April 19.—Walker Blaine re-
ceived a telegram from his father, James G.
Blaine, yesterday afternoon dated Fort Gib-
son and reading as follows: "Leave here
tonight. Hope to be in Chicago Wednes-
day morning."

Gentle genuine kangaroo shoes only \$5.00
at Rouse & Parsons's.

PATRICK EGAN HEARD FROM.

He Cables Henry Labouchere, Editor of
"Truth" and M. P. That Parrell Never
Wrote Him that "Times" Letter.

Standerone's Willful Shanderone. Sena-
torial Discharge from Custody in
Missouri. Railroad Accidents.

By the Associated Press.
LINCOLN, Neb., April 19.—Mr. Patrick
Egan has addressed the following cable
message to Hon. Henry Labouchere:

"Standerone's statements in reference to
me are unmitigated and willful shanderone.
Parrell never wrote me any such letter as
that quoted in the London Times. The
whole thing is a base fabrication."

DRIVING OUT THE SETTLERS.
Trouble Fearsed on Account of the Presi-
dent's Order.

MILWAUKEE, April 19.—A Minneapolis
special says: Captain E. E. Egan, in-
fantry, stationed at Fort Snelling, received
orders yesterday to proceed at once to Win-
nebago and Crow Creek reservations and
drive the settlers from these lands.

The company under command of Cap-
tain Myers left yesterday evening
and camped at Lanning last night.

The order was issued for the purpose of
the destruction of property if necessary,
and the use of guns and ball.

The greatest excitement exists and it would not be
surprising to see a miniature Red rebellion
instituted on these lands. This territory
was thrown open by the Arthur adminis-
tration on February 25, 1884, and thousands of
homesteaders from all parts of the United
States rushed in and took possession of the
lands. Cleveland's revocation of Arthur's
proclamation made hundreds of settlers

THE GROWING CROPS.
Generally Favorable Reports from Many
States.

CLEVELAND, April 19.—The Ohio Farmer
of this week will give reports from over
fifty counties in Ohio and a large number
from eight other states and Canada, as fol-
lows: About one-fourth of the counties in
Ohio report prospects for a crop of 25 to 50
per cent. of last year's crop; half of the
counties will have 50 to 75 per cent., and
the other quarter from 75 to 90 per cent. of
the crop. Only two counties in Ohio re-
port a fair crop.

Reports from Indiana, West Virginia, and
Kentucky are very similar to the Ohio re-
ports. In Michigan report 50 to 75 per cent.
of full crop, while Canada, New York,
Kentucky, Maryland and Missouri report
fair to full and abundant crops. In Vir-
ginia, when the matter was mentioned at
all, it appears that good drainage, good
preparation of soil and proper fertilizing
have prevented any injury, except from recent
drought.

NO SUPREME COURT JURY.
Important Decision on a Point Inciden-
tally Raised in a Railroad Suit.

COLUMBUS, O., April 19.—In the suit of
Corbin to eject the Union, from the control
of the Cleveland and Canton road, the
defendants demanded a jury trial before the
supreme court. The court decided this
morning that they had not the right to trial
by jury in this case. This is the first time
that this question was ever decided in Ohio.

DYNAMITE.
Two Men Killed—Others Injured.

MILWAUKEE, Wis., April 19.—At 9
o'clock this morning an explosion oc-
curred at shaft No. 2 of the new aqueduct
in the north heading. John Coyne was in-
stantly killed and a Hungarian, whose
name is unknown, was fatally injured.
Five others were hurt, some with broken
bones and arms and eyes blown out. The
accident was caused by the explosion of a
dynamite cartridge which remained unex-
ploded in one of the previous tunneling
holes.

FLORIDA.
The Senatorial Campaign.

JACKSONVILLE, Fla., April 19.—The
deadlock in the state legislature over the
senatorial question continues. The demo-
cratic caucus balloted all last night without
result. The last ballot was taken about 12
o'clock this morning and stood: Perry, 42;
Bloxham, 41. The caucus then adjourned
till evening. Arrangements are being
made for a meeting of the legislature on
the 21st inst. to elect a senator.

Assigned.
CINCINNATI, April 19.—Louis & Co.,
dealers in furniture and household goods,
etc., assigned today to Fred A. Johnson.

The assets are estimated at \$35,000; li-
abilities, \$40,000. The assignment was
caused by an attachment to secure a judg-
ment for \$20,000, in favor of Mrs. Edgar
M. Johnson. Preferences were made
amounting to \$15,000, of which \$12,000
was in favor of Annie Delacher, Lon-
don, England, an aunt of Mr. Fred Louis,
who alone carried on the business.

Picked Up at Sea.
NEW YORK, April 19.—The steamer Ben-
edict, from Wilmington, which arrived
yesterday, reports April 16th of Cape Hat-
ters picking up a yawl boat containing
Captain Henderson and four men, being
part of the crew of the schooner George
Matts, from Baltimore, for Charleston, she
having been from some unknown cause
blown up and took fire at 4 o'clock that
morning, killing the first mate, Mr. Suley
and one seaman. Those rescued lost every
thing except what they had on, one of whom
was badly burned about the face and hands.

Railroad Accident.
ST. JOHNSVILLE, N. Y., April 19.—A
passenger train on the New York Central
railroad met with an accident near this
place at 11:30 o'clock last night. A land-
slide caused the rails to spread, throwing
the engine from the track. Engineer Ed-
ward Cahart was killed, and Fireman E.
Wilce, of Albany, had a leg broken. The
passengers were badly shaken up, but none
were seriously injured.

AN OHIO MAN.
He Is Discharged from Custody in Mis-
souri.

SAN FRANCISCO, Cal., April 19.—Samuel
C. Schaffer, late of Lancaster, Ohio, was
discharged in Judge White's court, on an
order for having him a man named Allen
to kill John T. Blair, of New Jersey.
Allen failed to appear.

Terrific Storm Reported.
CHARLESTON, W. Va., April 19.—A ter-
rific storm passed over this section of the
state yesterday, doing little damage here
but sweeping timber, small houses, fences,
etc., in the country districts south of here.
Above Kanawha Falls large trees were
thrown across the railroad track, detain-
ing trains. The damage cannot be estimated.

Mr. Blaine Starts East.
CHICAGO, April 19.—Walker Blaine re-
ceived a telegram from his father, James G.
Blaine, yesterday afternoon dated Fort Gib-
son and reading as follows: "Leave here
tonight. Hope to be in Chicago Wednes-
day morning."

Gentle genuine kangaroo shoes only \$5.00
at Rouse & Parsons's.

HOT FIGHT BETWEEN PARTNERS.

Litigation Commenced in Court Today
Between Robert A. Ryan and City of York.

By his attorney, George Spence, esq.,
Joseph Ryan, the well-known stone con-
tractor, this Tuesday morning filed suit in
the court of common pleas, against Edward
Ryan and the city of Springfield.

The plaintiff sets forth June 1, 1886, the plaintiff
made a co-partnership agreement with said
Ryan by which they were to furnish the
material and perform all the work for the
abutments of three bridges for the P. C. &
St. L. railway—one two miles south of the
city, one at Oldtown and one at Nihil.

Among other stipulations was one that the
partners contribute equally to the expenses
for labor and material. About the same
time plaintiff and defendant jointly con-
structed the abutment of the Factory
street railway bridge at \$4.50 per cubic
yard of stone. The plaintiff commenced
the work on the Clark county bridge July
12, and continued regularly to superintend
the same until September 17, 1886, and
during that time paid out \$47,000 for hands,
\$234.88 and for materials, \$200. That about
September 15 an estimate of \$200,000 was
allowed by the railway company, which Ryan
received entirely to his own use, plaintiff
receiving no means to carry on the work.

THE CAP SHEAF.
It was put on about September 20, when Ryan,
according to the parties, told the plaintiff
that Ryan had no longer any authority and
not to obey him. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had another contract with the
railway company, and that he had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money for the same. The plaintiff
charges that Ryan had received the money
for the same. The plaintiff charges that
Ryan had received the money for the same.

Without further delay, the plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work. The plaintiff
demanded that Ryan should pay to him the
money paid out or share in the profits as a
partner, or to pay his (Ryan's) share of
the expenses of the work.

The plaintiff charges that Ryan had received
the money